# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON PORTLAND DIVISION

## HEATHER VANCE-ZSCHOCHE,

Plaintiff, No. CV 11-85-MO

v. OPINION AND ORDER

#### BRIAN ALEXANDER DODD,

Defendant.

# MOSMAN, J.,

Heather Vance-Zschoche and Brian Alexander Dodd jointly move for a protective order to protect Ms. Vance-Zschoche from harassment and abuse by a nonparty. Federal courts have limited authority to issue injunctions and restraining orders. Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d)(2). Injunctions and restraining orders can bind only (1) parties to a suit; (2) the parties' officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys; or (3) other persons who are in active concert with those in the first two categories. *Id.* The proposed protective order would bind a person who does not fall under any of these categories, so I am required to deny the parties' Petition for Order of Permanent Protection (#9).

The parties also move to seal this case file entirely. A federal court in this circuit can seal judicial records only if the parties show compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings. *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass'n*, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010). In evaluating whether compelling reasons exist, I am not permitted to rely on "hypothesis or conjecture." *Id.* at 679 (internal quotations omitted).

## 1 – OPINION AND ORDER

Case 3:11-cv-00085-ST Document 17 Filed 04/07/11 Page 2 of 2

In this case the parties have sought to seal this file to protect "employment and

publicity," and to prevent further harassment and abuse of Ms. Vance-Zschoche's children by

their father. (Motion (#9) 31, 35.) Because Ms. Vance-Zschoche has submitted ample evidence

of his propensity for violence, I am inclined to seal documents that could help their father locate

her or her children. However, without knowing what records, if any, will provide this

information, I decline to seal the entire file. The parties may renew their motion to seal as to

specific documents.

The parties' Petition for Order of Permanent Protection and Motion to Seal (#9) is

DENIED with leave to renew the motion to seal as to specific documents.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 7th day of April, 2011.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman MICHAEL W. MOSMAN

**United States District Court** 

2 – OPINION AND ORDER